

From: planningcomments@highpeak.gov.uk
To: [Planning Comments \(HPBC\)](#)
Subject: Comment Received from Public Access
Date: 24 December 2022 11:57:00

Application Reference No. : HPK/2022/0471
Site Address: LAND AT Longclough Drive Simmondley Glossop Derbyshire
Comments by: Kate Raine
From:

Longclough Drive
Simmondley
Glossop

Phone:

Email:

Submission: Objection

Comments: I strongly object to this application and it should be refused. I am not even sure why it has been validated? Why is this applicant being allowed to submit piecemeal applications for parts of the site rather than a single new application covering the site as a whole? I note most of the documents used in the application are copies from application HPK/2021/0081 for the other 6 houses on the site.

The whole site is sensitive and complex and anything happening on even part of it will affect all residents on Brookside and Longclough Drive. Allowing the site to be considered in small parts will mask the true impact and does not allow residents fair consultation. I am sure that every developer would prefer to have their sites considered in separate small parts to circumvent responsibilities, restrictions and limitations.

Environment Agency

I note the consultation response from the Environment Agency on application HPK/2022/0473, who would need to be consulted on this application:

“This development is likely to require a permit under the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 from the Environment Agency for any proposed works or structures, in, under, over or within eight metres of the bank of the Long Clough Brook which, is designated a “main river”.

This was in relation to plots 6 on HPK/2021/0081 (now proposed plot 1 and 2) and the public footpath alongside Longclough Brook. I also note the Environment Agency was not properly consulted over reserved matters HPK/2021/0081 after changes were made and have not yet been consulted on condition 6, as requested, DOC/2022/0051. Therefore plots 1 and 2 in this application will both require a permit from the Environment Agency.

The appeal APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 also required “58. However, as an undeveloped buffer zone adjacent to the Brook would be a guiding principle of any landscaping scheme I consider it necessary to attach a condition requiring this aspect to be taken into account prior to commencement of the development. This is necessary in the biodiversity and water quality interests of the Brook and its immediate surroundings.”

Backed up by APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 “condition 14) No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision of an undeveloped buffer zone adjacent to the Brook has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall take place in accordance with the approved scheme thereafter.”

This appears to have been ignored at reserved matters HPK/2021/0081 and in this application. How is this acceptable?

Drainage

I note on the application form that surface water will be draining into the mains sewer. This is the least

favourable option on the list given by United Utilities. At the appeal for outline planning for six houses on this site the Planning Inspector included a condition that the surface water had to discharge into a separate drainage system. APP/H1033/W/17/3177730 Condition 11 he approved development shall make provision for separate systems of drainage for foul and surface water; no surface water shall discharge to the public sewerage system either directly or indirectly. Why should this application be any different?

Parking and Construction Management Plan

Even the 6 houses approved in HPK/2021/0081 will be a great burden and harmful to the residents of the street. Parking is a long term issue that has been commented on so many times. The street cannot lose any more parking space. Many houses on the street have no drives or parking spaces and the street is already full of vehicles. Where are these residents supposed to park their cars?

I also note the comments from Highways on this application that all construction storage and traffic etc has to be within the site and the public highway cannot be used without permission (contractors clearing the site have already ignored this). It is not clear how this is to be achieved for the 6 houses (HPK/2021/0081) and yet again no details have been set out on how this will be achieved in this application.

Summary

There are now 4 open applications for this site (DOC/2022/0051, HPK/2022/0470, HPK/2022/0471, HPK/2022/0473). It is both confusing and dangerous to make decisions in such a piecemeal fashion for such a sensitive and complex site such as this.

For 40 years applications on this site have been refused due to the harmful nature of any development on this site. The Council found even 6 houses on this site to be unacceptable in 2016 (HPK/2016/0416 Decision). The Outline planning was only agreed by the planning inspector at appeal (APP/H1033/W/17/3177730) for 6 houses as the rest of the site was to be public open space (POS) covered by a legal obligation. This was substantially more POS than previous applications and the only thing that made it acceptable.

I note that in the appeal for the Hollin Cross Lane site (APP/H1033/W/22/3303566) that High Peak Borough Council have stated that, 'In terms of the Housing Delivery Test, the Council has also exceeded its housing requirements over the past 3 years'. More than 6 houses being approved on this site will only be for the benefit of the applicant. Allowing more houses to be built on this site would be extremely harmful. It would overburden both the site and the street. It would reduce the compensatory POS to meaningless levels, especially as no thought has been made into making it at all accessible (see my comments DOC/2022/0051 17/10/2022). Why should the residents of the street have to suffer just for the developer to increase his profit margins?

This application should be refused. I reiterate my previous comments that if the applicant wishes to build any more than six houses on this site then an entirely new application for the whole site should be submitted.

Do you really need to print out this Email? Be green - keep it on the screen.

This email is intended for the addressee(s) only and may contain sensitive, privileged or confidential information that could be protectively marked. If you are not the addressee please do not use the information in any way. If you have received this email in error please notify the sender immediately and delete it from your system. Thank you.

The Council may be required to disclose this email or any responses to it under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. The way in which we handle personal information is set out in our privacy notice and is available at <https://www.highpeak.gov.uk/YourData>
